

REMARKS

In the Office Action of August 27, 2004, the Examiner rejected all pending claims, 1-18. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pannu, U.S. Patent No. 6,735,741. The Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 10-11, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pannu and further in view of Raz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,311,221. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants traverse these rejections.

In the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-17, the Examiner argues that Pannu discloses "analyzing the received information and determining a content server by selecting one of the content servers that is closest to an anticipated access point for the email communication where the closest content server is determined based on recipient's domain name and recipient's mail profile (col. 6, lines 3-52).” The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection. Pannu fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "determining the one of the content servers by choosing the one of the content servers closest to an anticipated access point for the email communication, where the closest content server is determined based on a recipient's message accessing profile an the recipient's domain name.”

In contrast Pannu describes a system for linking to data from a document that includes a pointer to the data in a first storage device, which may be maintained in a network file server. In particular, Pannu discloses a system for replicating data bases across the network. The Examiner cites to col. 6, lines 3-52 as disclosing choosing a content server based on the recipient's domain name and recipient's mail profile. However, nothing in col. 6, nor anywhere else within Pannu, discloses determining the

content server based on the recipient's message accessing profile as required by independent claims 1, 7, and 12. Pannu does disclose a link program resident in a client which chooses a server from which to access linked documents based on the "mail domain used by the client." (col. 6, lines 18-19). However, this is not the same as choosing a content server based on the recipient's domain name and the recipient's message accessing profile as recited in the claims. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that they have traversed the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-17.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-6, 10-11, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pannu in view of Razl. Because these claims depend from claims 1, 7, and 12, respectively, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons argued above.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance for the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 28, 2005

By: Douglas S. Weinstein
Douglas S. Weinstein
Reg. No. 43,249
with
permission
HFB